UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/975,938	10/15/2001	Tetsuro Motoyama	205850US-2	2679

22850 7590 12/21/2004

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER	
ENGLAND, DAVID E	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2143	

DATE MAILED: 12/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/975,938	MOTOYAMA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	David E. England	2143	

-- Th MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cov r sh t with th correspondenc address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *15 October 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-12* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-12* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *1/15/02, 8/16/02,* 4/26/04, 10/20/04
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DC

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1 – 12 are presented for examination.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 6, 8, 10 and 12 are objected to because of the following informalities: The abbreviated limitations of "POP3" and "MIME" could have more than one meaning to the abbreviation, (e.g. POP3 could be "Post Office Protocol 3" or Point Of Presence 3"). Applicant is asked to specifically state in the claim what the abbreviations stand for. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1 – 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

5. In regards to claims 1 and 3 recites the limitation "the other lines". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

6. As to claims 1, 3, 5 and 9, the limitation of "data structure definition" is not specifically defined in the specification. Applicant does appear to have a data structure, (e.g. page 37, lines 6 – 20), but does not have the "definition" of the data structures or if the phrase of "definition" is used in it's traditional manner, (i.e., a statement of the meaning of a word, phrase, or term, as in a dictionary entry.). Applicant is asked to specifically point to section of the main body of the claimed invention, along with figures, to explain the limitation of "data structure definition".

7. As to claims 5 and 9, the limitation of "data element" is not specifically defined in the specification. Applicant does appear to have multiple types of data elements that could be interpreted as "the" data elements but it is not specifically stated in the main body of the specification of the claimed invention which "data elements" are being claimed. Applicant is asked to specifically point to section of the main body of the claimed invention, along with figures, to explain the specific "data elements" the claim language is referring to.

8. Claims 2, 4, 6 – 8 and 10 – 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, for their dependences on the above disclosed claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 1 – 5 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen (6757714) in view of Nackman et al. (6182281) (hereinafter Nackman) in further view of Narurkar et al. (6711624) (hereinafter Narurkar).

11. As per claim 5, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Hansen teaches a system for remotely monitoring a device, the system including:

12. A) a receiver manager class, (e.g. col. 6, line 66 – col. 7, line 10, *"customer relation ship management system software"*), and

13. B) a data retriever, the data retriever including:

14. i) a data retriever class, (e.g. col. 6, line 66 – col. 7, line 10, *"XML parser"*),

15. ii) an email processor, (e.g. col. 6, line 66 – col. 7, line 10, *"e-mail program"*), and

16. iii) a parser, (e.g. col. 6, line 66 – col. 7, line 10);

17. a method of receiving information concerning the remotely monitored device, the information being contained in a message that also includes a message type designation, the method comprising:

18. a) the data retriever class invoking a function in the email processor to read a line and to read other lines from the message, (e.g. col. 6, lines 43 – 55);

19. b) the data retriever class invoking a function in the parser to parse the line of the message to extract the message type designation, (e.g. col. 6, lines 52 – 65);

20. c) the data retriever class returning the extracted message type designation to the receiver manager class, (e.g. col. 6, line 66 – col. 7, line 10); but does not specifically teach d) the receiver manager class determining a data structure definition based on the extracted message type designation and passing the data structure definition to the data retriever class; and

21. e) the data retriever class invoking a function in the parser to read data elements from the other lines and to insert the data elements according to the data structure definition.

22. Nackman d) the receiver manager class determining a data structure definition based on the extracted message type designation and passing the data structure definition to the data retriever class, (e.g. col. 12, lines 16 – 31 & Figures 6 – 8).

23. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Nackman with Hansen because when newly added declarations have been recorded and are available for subsequent lookup. Furthermore, parsing alone is insufficient since interfaces can be dependent upon constant expressions, which can themselves depend upon the sizes of type definitions that are held in a manager type module.

24. Narurkar teaches e) the data retriever class invoking a function in the parser to read data elements from the other lines and to insert the data elements according to the data structure definition, (e.g. col. 17, line 62 – col. 18, line 22 & col. 19, lines 51 – 67).

25. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Narurkar with the combine system of Hansen and Nackman because parsing module would collapse multiple successive spaces on each of

the text lines into single spaces therefore saving space for the insertion of other parsed information to be inserted.

26. Claims 1 – 4 and 9 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

27. Claims 6 – 8 and 10 – 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen, Nackman and Narurkar as applied to claims 5 & 9 above, and in further view of Hall et al. (5826023) (hereinafter Hall).

28. As per claim 6, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Hansen, Nackman and Narurkar do not specifically teach the message is included in an email message received by a POP3 server; and the email processor includes functions to interface to the POP3 server.

29. Hall teaches the message is included in an email message received by a POP3 server; and the email processor includes functions to interface to the POP3 server, (e.g. col. 4, lines 25 – 41). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Hall with the combine system of Hansen, Nackman and Narurkar because clients that are making use of the POP3 server support be allowed to move mail through a SNADS network to other POP3 clients.

30. As per claim 7, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Hansen teaches the message is included in an attachment to the email, (e.g. col. 4, line 58 – col. 5, line 9).

31. As per claim 7, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Hansen, Nackman and Narurkar do not specifically teach the attachment is a MIME attachment. Hall teaches the attachment is a MIME attachment, (e.g. col. 6, lines 8 – 30). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Hall with the combine system of Hansen, Nackman and Narurkar because MIME enables them to send and receive formatted non-ASCII messages similar to graphics, audio, and video files such as GIF graphics files and PostScript files via the Internet mail system. In addition, MIME supports messages in character sets other than ASCII.

32. Claims 8 and 10 – 12 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

Conclusion

33. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

34. a. Smith et al. U.S. Patent No. 6785015 discloses System and method for monitoring a computer system process or peripheral.

35. b. Singhal U.S. Patent No. 6256666 discloses Method and system for remotely managing electronic mail attachments.

36. c. Davis et al. U.S. Patent No. 5937160 discloses Systems, methods and computer program products for updating hypertext documents via electronic mail.

37. d. Smiga et al. U.S. Patent No. 6421678 discloses Method and apparatus for group action processing between users of a collaboration system.

38. e. Zoken U.S. Patent No. 5944787 discloses Method for automatically finding postal addresses from e-mail addresses.

39. f. Ho et al. U.S. Patent No. 6061502 discloses Communications device with remote device identifier recognition and transmission in accordance with the recognized identifier.

40. g. Chang et al. U.S. Patent No. 6598076 discloses Method and apparatus for electronically communicating an electronic message having an electronic attachment.

41. h. Yeager U.S. Patent No. 6167402 discloses High performance message store.

42. i. Pollack U.S. Patent No. 6505236 discloses Network-based mail attachment storage system and method.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David E. England whose telephone number is 571-272-3912. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur, 7:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on 571-272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

David E. England
Examiner
Art Unit 2143

De

DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100